SINGLE BENCH

(2) (4)

CF(00)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (C) No.6289 /2006

Petitioner

Rishi Kumar Patel, aged about 37 years, son of Shri Kriparam Patel, occupation – Manager, Prathmik Laghu Vanopaj Sahkari Samiti Maryadit, Kilkila Jila – Union Dharamjaigarh, resident of village Piparhi, Tah. Lailunga, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

P.R. No. 6318/06
Presented by Shri Amar Sharma
dated 13/11/06

Versus

Respondents :

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through – the Secretary, Department of Society, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Registrar, Department of Firms and Society, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Deputy Registrar, Department of Firms and Society, Raigarh (C.G.)
4. Zila Union – Laghu Vanopaj Sahkari Samiti Maryadit Dharamjaigarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.), THROUGH – Its Managing Director.

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CG/20/73/96
13/11/06
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

RECEIVED COPY
13/11/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

3 (5)

5. The President, Prathmik Lahu Vanopaj Sahkari Samiti, Kilkila, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

6. Subhash Chandra Bhera, Prathmik Lahu Vanopaj Sahkari Samiti, Kilkila, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, Dist. Raigarh (C.G.)

WRIT UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, CERTERIORAI ETC OR ANY OTHER DIRECTIONS OR ORDER

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(20)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.(S) No. 6289/06 सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	25/11/2006 Shri Amit Sharma, Counsel for the petitioner. Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the State. Heard. Petitioner, who was Manager of Prathmik Laghu Vanopaj Sahkari Samiti Maryadit, Kilkila, has been removed from his services vide letter dated 11/10/2006 (Annexure/P-1). Removal of the petitioner falls within Section 64 of the Chhattisgarh Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 (henceforth, "the Act") and that being a dispute, it should have been referred to the Registrar, but instead of doing so, petitioner has invoked writ jurisdiction of this Court. I am of the view that he should first refer the dispute to the Registrar and thereafter if any exigency arises, he may approach the High Court. With the aforesaid direction, the writ petition is dismissed at the motion stage itself. In view of the above, M.W.P.No.4626/2006 stands disposed of. Certified copy as per rules today. Sd/- V.K.Shrivastava Judge	

Raju

(पीछे देखिये)

25.11.06